



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,904	11/05/2003	Monica P. Felder	014682.1	2903
44870	7590	02/27/2006	EXAMINER	
MOORE & VAN ALLEN, PLLC P.O. Box 13706 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709			FABER, DAVID	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/605,904		FELDER ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	David Faber		2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed 9 January 2006.
2. In the amendment, Claims 1, 14, 21, 26, and 32 have been amended. Claims 1-36 are pending. The rejection of Claims 1-3, 7-11, 13, 14-15, 18-20, 26, and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Moody et al. (US Patent #5,890,177) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment. The rejection of Claims 4-5, 16-17, and 27-29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US Patent #5,890,177, patented 3/30/1999) in further in view of (Microsoft, "Release Notes for Windows XP Service Pack 1 and Service Park 1a," published 9/9/2003) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment. The rejection of Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US Patent #5,890,177, patented 3/30/1999) in further in view of (Online Training Solutions, Inc, "Microsoft Office Word 2003 Step By Step," published 9/24/2003) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment. The rejection of Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moody et al (US Patent #5,890,177, patented 3/30/1999) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment. The rejection of Claims 21-25, 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US Patent #5,890,177, patented 3/30/1999) in further in view of (Online Training Solutions, Inc, "Microsoft Office Word 2003 Step By Step," published 9/24/2003) in further view of (Microsoft, "Release Notes for Windows XP Service Pack 1 and Service Park 1a," published 9/9/2003) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 13, 26, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ramaley et al (US Patent #6,931,592, filed 5/22/2000).

As per independent Claim 1, Ramaley et al discloses a method comprising:

- assigning a predetermined number of line items to a single writer by a user on a system to manage documentation; (Column 3, lines 23-27– a completed document contains a predetermined number of line items. These predetermined line items within a document is sent a single reviewer by the author on a system for reviewing an electronic document (Abstract, line 1).)
- reviewing and investigating each assigned line item; and (Column 6, line 21-24 – Discloses the reviewer to receive the document and edits the document where editing a document thoroughly involves reviewing and investigating each line.)

Art Unit: 2178

- performing any changes related to each assigned line item across all affected books. (Column 6, line 21-24 – The reviewer edits the lines in the document thus are performing changes. In addition, since a book is made of a document or multiple documents, a document is considered a book.)

As per dependent Claim 2, Claim 2 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and is rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Ramaley et al discloses a method further comprising:

- electronically accessing each affected book to perform any changes (Column 6, line 21-24: Discloses editing the electronic document in an appropriate application software (Column 3, lines 39-40). Thus, using application software to open an electronic document is electronically accessing it.)

As per dependent Claim 3, Claim 3 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and is rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Ramaley et al disclose a method:

- each change is performed across all affected books regardless of book ownership. (Column 6, lines 15-36, – The reviewer who edited the copy of the original document edited it regardless of not actually owning the original document.)

As per dependent Claim 7, Ramaley et al discloses a method further comprising:

Art Unit: 2178

- sending a notice in response to completion of any changes related to each line item. (FIG 6; Column 6, lines 28-30 – the reviewer responds by means of email with the edited document on the completion of editing the document with a statement in the email stating the document has been reviewed)

As per dependent Claim 8, Claim 8 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and is rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Ramaley et al discloses a method further comprising:

- sending a notice in response to completion of any changes related to all assigned line item. (FIG 6; Column 6, lines 28-30 – the reviewer responds by means of email with the edited document on the completion of editing the document with a statement in the email stating the document has been reviewed)

As per dependent Claim 13, Claim 13 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and is rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Ramaley et al discloses a method further comprising:

- assigning each writer responsibility for a selected number of books. (Column 3, lines 23-27– the author chooses to have a document reviewed, thus assigns a reviewer the responsibility of reviewing the author's selected number of documents, one document in this instance, by transmitting the document to the reviewer to be reviewed.)

As per independent Claim 26, Claim 26 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and is rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Moody et al discloses a method further comprising:

- means for assigning a predetermined number of line items to each writer; (Column 3, lines 23-27– a completed document contains a predetermined number of line items. These predetermined line items within a document is sent a single reviewer by the author on a system for reviewing an electronic document (Abstract, line 1).)
- a system memory to store line item assignments; (Column 4, lines 27-28; 34-38)
- at least one book storable on the system memory, and (Column 4, lines 44-47 discloses an example where an electronic document may be stored in the RAM of hard disk, thus one has the ability to store a document. In addition, Ramaley et al disclosed different locations of storage where information, such as a document, is stored. (Column 4, lines 27-28; 34-38)
- means for accessing and performing any changes related to each line item across all affected books. (It is inherent that one of the ordinary skill in the art is able to retrieve the document from memory or storage to perform any changes when necessary.)

As per dependent Claim 30, Claim 30 recites similar limitations as in Claim 7 and is rejected under rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 9-12, 14-15, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramaley et al (US Patent #6,931,592, filed 5/22/2000).

As per dependent Claim 9, Claim 9 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and is rejected under rationale. Ramaley et al discloses the reviewer edits the document (Column 6, line 21-24) where editing a document thoroughly involves reviewing and investigating each line.) However, Ramaley et al fails to specifically disclose reviewing any changes related to each line item across all books. On the other hand, it was well-known to one of ordinary skill when a user, such as the reviewer, finishes editing a document, the user would use proofreading skills in his work, prior to submission.

It was obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Ramaley et al with the use of proofreading above since it would have provided the benefit of the improving the correctness and the use of its language of a document when proofreading a document.

Furthermore, such electronic documents can be open with Microsoft Word within Microsoft Office, wherein Ramaley et al discloses his invention incorporated into

Art Unit: 2178

OFFICE 2000 by Microsoft (Column 3, lines 14-18). However, Ramaley fails to specifically disclose Microsoft Word includes proofreading skills. It was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art Microsoft Word contained proofreading options, such as spell checker and grammar checker, that reviews the opened document and displays any errors it comes upon. Therefore, by ability of the Microsoft Word proofreading the document after editing, the user is reviewing any changes to the document.

It was obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Ramaley et al with Microsoft Word above since Microsoft Word would have provided the benefit of the quickness in improving the correctness and the use of its language of a document.

As per dependent Claim 10, Ramaley et al fails to specifically disclose closing each line item in response to review and approval of all changes related to the line item. Based on the rejection of Claim 9, and the rationale incorporated, the reviewer would send the edit electronic document to the author. (FIG. 5; Column 6, lines 32-35) It was well-known to one of ordinary skill that when the reviewer submits his revision of the document, after proofreading the document, the reviewer is therefore approving the changes that were made. Thus, after each edit or line change is approved of reviewing, each is finished, or closed, from being inspected by the reviewer.

It was obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Ramaley et al with the disclosure above since it would have provided the benefit of the improving the correctness and the use of its language of a document in reviewing and approving a document.

As per dependent Claim 11, Claim 11 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and is rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Ramaley et al fails to specifically disclose performing a whole book inspection in response to closing all line items associated with the book. However, Ramaley et al discloses after merging the documents, a review bar tool is displayed (FIG 8; Column 10, lines 55-57), wherein the reviewing toolbar disclosed in Column 8, line 65 – Column 9, line 3. Then, the author determines to if he/she wishes to end the review process and complete the review cycle on the document. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention for the author to have inspected the whole document prior completing the review cycle since it would have provided the benefit of including a second opinion on the edited document, improving the correctness and the language of a document even more, and strengthen the overall document structure.

As per dependent Claim 12, Claim 12 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and is rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Ramaley et al fails to specifically disclose correcting any structural, retrieval or usability problems associated with each book. However, Ramaley et al does disclose that a reviewer review the original document. (Column 4, lines 21-25) It was well-known to one of the ordinary skill in the art that when the reviewer was reviewing the document were correcting any structural, retrieval or usability problems in the document. For example, if the reviewer sees the original document failed to indent the beginning of a new paragraph, then the reviewer would have fixed the document by indenting the first line of the paragraph, thus fixing a structural problem.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ramaley et al's method with correcting any structural, retrieval or usability problems since it would have allowed a user to produce a well-structured, correct, formal document.

As per independent Claim 14, Claim 14 recites similar limitations as in Claims 1, 9, and 10 combined and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent Claim 15, Claim 15 recites similar limitations as in Claim 14 and is rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Ramaley et al disclose a method:

- each change is performed across all affected books regardless of book ownership. (Column 6, lines 15-36 – The reviewer who edited the copy of the original document edited it regardless of not actually owning the original document.)

As per dependent Claim 18, Claim 18 recites similar limitations as in Claim 14 and is rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Ramaley et al discloses a method further comprising:

- sending a notice in response to completion of any changes related to all assigned line item. (FIG 6; Column 6, lines 28-30 – the reviewer responds by means of email with the edited document on the completion of editing the document with a statement in the email stating the document has been reviewed)

As per dependent Claim 19, Claim 19 recites similar limitations as in Claim 9 and is rejected under Ramaley et al.

As per dependent Claim 20, Claim 20 recites similar limitations as in Claim 11 and is rejected under Ramaley et al.

7. Claims 4-5, 16-17, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramaley et al (US Patent #6,931,592, filed 5/22/2000). in further in view of (Microsoft, "Release Notes for Windows XP Service Pack 1 and Service Pack 1a," published 9/9/2003).

As per dependent Claims 4 and 5, Claims 4 and 5 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and is rejected under the same rationale. Furthermore, Ramaley et al discloses a method further comprising:

- storing the document in a selected location in a memory. (Column 4, lines 44-47 discloses an example where an electronic document may be stored in the RAM of hard disk, thus one has the ability to store a document. In addition, Ramaley et al disclosed different locations of storage where information, such as a document, is stored. (Column 4, lines 27-28; 34-38)

However, Ramaley et al fails to specifically disclose preparing a document that includes a description for each change for each book, and a pointer associated with each description of each change to link to a current version of the affected book.

However, Microsoft discloses a release notes document that lists the changes of its Windows XP Service Pack 1 update. (Microsoft, pages 1-3) In addition, each change

Art Unit: 2178

has an ID that is hyperlinked pointing to a separate document associated with each description of the change to the current version. (Microsoft, pages 1-3)

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ramaley et al's method with Microsoft's method of a document release notes since it would have allowed the user obtain information about the updated version and the changes that were addressed.

As per dependent Claims 16 and 17, Claims 16 and 17 recite similar limitations as in Claim 4 and 5 and is rejected under Ramaley et al and Microsoft.

As per dependent Claims 27-29, the applicant recites the system for performing the method of Claims 4 and 5. Therefore, Claims 27-29 are similarly rejected under Moody et al and Microsoft.

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Ramaley et al (US Patent #6,931,592, filed 5/22/2000) in further in view of (Online Training Solutions, Inc, "Microsoft Office Word 2003 Step By Step," published 9/24/2003).

As per dependent Claim 6, Claims 6 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and is rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Ramaley et al fails to specifically disclose tracking line items and changes related to the line items. However, Online Training Solutions, Inc. discloses a method in Microsoft Word that tracks changes and which lines the changes occur on. (Pg 1-2, Fig 1) Figure 1 discloses text overwritten and has a comment balloon pop up to indicate what text was just overwritten. The comment balloon points to the line that was changed. In addition, it would have been well-known

Art Unit: 2178

to one of the ordinary skill in the art to use the line number indicator located within the status bar in Microsoft Word to determine which line was change once the balloon indicator appeared indicating the change.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ramaley et al's with Online Training Solution, Inc's disclosure since it would have allowed a user to be able to make revisions to a document without losing the original text.

9. Claims 21-22, and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramaley et al (US Patent #6,931,592, filed 5/22/2000) in further in view of Online Training Solutions, Inc (Online Training Solutions, Inc, "Microsoft Office Word 2003 Step By Step," published 9/24/2003) in further view of Fuselier et al (US Patent #6,920,495, filed 8/31/2000) in further view in Symantec (Symantec, "Time Line 5.0 User Manual," published 1991)

As per independent Claim 21, Claim 21 recites similar limitations as in Claims 6 and is rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Ramaley et al discloses a system comprising:

- a system memory associated with the processor to store at least one book, the at least one book being accessible to perform any changes related to each line item effecting the at least one book.

(FIG 1; Column 1, lines 23-33 – The system includes memory that is connected to the processor by a bus. In addition, Column 4, lines 35-38, Ramaley et al discloses a

Art Unit: 2178

list of mass storage devices in which data is stored. One of ordinary skill in the art is able to retrieve the book from memory or storage to perform any changes. In addition, since a book is made up consisting a document or multiple documents, a document is considered a book.)

- a processor to track each line item, wherein a predetermined number of line item are assigned to each writer; and

Based on the rejection of tracking line items and changes in Claim 6, and the rationale incorporated within, Ramaley et al discloses a processor (Figure 1, block 121) that is connected the operating system (FIG 1, block 135) and to a document editing program module (FIG 1, block 138) which inherently processes the tracking feature in a word processing program. In addition, Ramaley discloses a completed document sent to editors (Column 3, lines 23-27), whereby a complete document is a predetermined number of line items.

However, Ramaley et al and Online Training Solution, Inc fails to specifically disclose a processor to track each line where each line item-being tracked with respect to a group comprising an owner of the line item; planned and actual start dates; planned and actual end dates or completion dates; any driver associated with each line item, status of each item; and any issues with each line items. On the other hand, Fuselier et al discloses a project tracker that display the owner (Column 14, line 65 – Column 15, lines 4), project start and end dates, status of assigned task (Column 14, lines 24-26), and issues reported (e.g. FIG 26; Column 14, lines 31-38; Column 15, lines 48-55)

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ramaley et al's processor and Online Training Solution, Inc's disclosure with Fuselier's et al project tracker since it would have provided the benefit of detailed project information regarding on the length, management, and issues regarding the project itself.

In addition, Ramaley et al's, Online Training Solution, Inc's, and Fuselier's et al fail specifically disclose planned start dates, and any drivers associated with each line item. However, Ramaley et al discloses a mouse and used as input device inherently used to operate a Microsoft operating system and a Microsoft word processor. In addition, Symantec discloses scheduled starts dates in which a task is planned (pp 6-6 – 6-8) and discloses the use of mouse drivers for mouse support (pp 1-18). Since Ramaley et al discloses a mouse is used as input device, the mouse would have been used to edit and review documents.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ramaley et al's processor, Online Training Solution, Inc's disclosure and Fuselier's et al with Symantec since Symantec's disclosure of planning dates and drivers for mouse support since it would have provided the benefit of detailed project information regarding on the length, management, and issues regarding the project itself.

As per dependent Claim 22, Ramaley et al discloses a method further comprising:

Art Unit: 2178

- at least one input device to make changes related to any line items requiring such changes. (FIG 1, item 142, 140 – A keyboard or a mouse is usable to make changes to any line items requiring a change.)

As per independent Claim 32, Claim 32 recites similar limitations as in Claims 6 and 21 combined and is rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Ramaley et al discloses a system comprising:

- facilitating any changes related to each line item across each affected book. (FIG 2, blocks 220-260 & FIG 1, items 140, 142; Column 5, lines 13-25 – Numerous computer components are disclosed, e.g. the keyboard, enabling the author in reviewing any changes from the edits the editors made to the document and using a network to communicate between the editors and the author.)

As per dependent Claims 33, the applicant recites a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method of Claim 8.

Therefore, Claims 33 are similarly rejected under Ramaley et al.

10. Claims 23-25, and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramaley et al (US Patent #6,931,592, filed 5/22/2000) in further in view of (Online Training Solutions, Inc, "Microsoft Office Word 2003 Step By Step," published 9/24/2003) in further view of Fuselier et al (US Patent #6,920,495, filed

Art Unit: 2178

8/31/2000) in further view in Symantec (Symantec, "Time Line 5.0 User Manual," published 1991) further view of Microsoft (Microsoft, "Release Notes for Windows XP Service Pack 1 and Service Park 1a," published 9/9/2003).

As per dependent Claims 23-25, Claim 23-25 recites similar limitations as in Claim 21 and is rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Ramaley et al discloses a method further comprising:

- stored the document in a selected location in a memory. (Column 4, lines 44-47 discloses an example where an electronic document may be stored in the RAM of hard disk, thus one has the ability to store a document. In addition, Ramaley et al disclosed different locations of storage where information, such as a document, is stored. (Column 4, lines 27-28; 34-38)

Ramaley et al, Online Training Solutions, Inc., Fuselier et al, and Symantec failed to specifically disclose preparing a document including a description for change for each book, and a pointer associated with each description of each change to link to a current version of the affected book. However, Microsoft discloses a release notes document that lists the changes of its Windows XP Service Pack 1 update. (Microsoft, pages 1-3) In addition, each change has an ID that is hyperlinked pointing to a separate document associated with each description of the change to the current version. (Microsoft, pages 1-3)

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ramaley et al, Online Training Solutions, Inc., Fuselier et al, and Symantec's methods with Microsoft's method of document release

Art Unit: 2178

notes since it would have allowed the user obtain information about the updated version and the changes that were addressed.

As per dependent Claims 34-35, the applicant recites a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method of Claims 23-25. Therefore, Claims 34-35 are similarly rejected under Ramaley et al, Online Training Solutions, Inc, Fuselier et al and Time Line, and Microsoft.

As per dependent Claims 36, the applicant recites a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method of Claim 10. Therefore, Claims 36 are similarly rejected under Ramaley et al.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

As detailed above, the Ramaley et al, Fuselier et al, and Symantec references have been added to address the amended limitation. Applicant amended the independent claims to change the scope of the limitations from a sense of multiple writers with the original limitation of *each writer* to the amended limitation of a *single writer*, thus Ramaley et al, Fuselier et al, and Symantec references were added to necessitate the new grounds.

Art Unit: 2178

12. Applicant's arguments, in with respect to Claims 4-5, 16-17, and 27-29, argues *that there is no teaching or suggestion in Moody and the Release Notes that their teachings may be combined so as to provide the present invention as recited in the claims and that such motivation comes from Applicant's disclosure* wherein the Applicant concludes it approaches impermissible hindsight and should be avoided.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

"Microsoft Release for Windows XP Service Pack 1 and Service Pack 1a" (hereinafter Release Notes) discloses a document that was prepared for the released of a Microsoft update for Windows operating system. The Release Notes document discloses a link of every bug that been fixed, change, or added or deleted feature that reflects the new software, Service Pack 1, to be installed on Microsoft operating system. For each update or change, short description is shown and a link or a pointer (ID), points to a separate document disclosing the full detailed description of the update, change or addition associated with that corresponding update. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to

Art Unit: 2178

combined Ramaley et al's method with Release Notes' disclosure of update document since it would have allowed the user to obtain information about the updated version and the changes that were addressed.

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.



Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Faber whose telephone number is 571-272-2751. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8am to 430pm.

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Faber
Patent Examiner
AU 2178



STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER